arXiv:1402.1574v1 [math.AP] 7 Feb 2014

KLEIN-GORDON-MAXWELL EQUATIONS IN HIGH DIMENSIONS

PIERRE-DAMIEN THIZY

Abstract. We prove the existence of a mountain-pass solution and the a priori bound property for the electrostatic Klein-Gordon-Maxwell equations in high dimension.

In what follows we let (M, g) be a smooth closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 3$, closed meaning compact without boundary. We let $2^\star = \frac{2n}{n-2}$ be the critical Sobolev exponent for the embeddings of H^1, the Sobolev space of functions in L^2 with one derivative in L^2. We let also $p \in (2, 2^\star]$, $q > 0$, $m_0, m_1 > 0$, and $\omega \in (-m_0, m_0)$ be real numbers. The electrostatic Klein-Gordon-Maxwell system we investigate in this paper is written as

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u + m_0^2 u = u^{p-1} + \omega^2 (1 - qv)^2 u \\ \Delta_g v + (m_1^2 + q^2 u^2) v = q u^2 \ , \end{cases} \tag{0.1}$$

where $\Delta_g = -\mathrm{div}_g \nabla$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator. This system arises when looking for standing waves solutions of the full Klein-Gordon-Maxwell system in Proca formalism (see Hebey and Truong [37]). The first equation in (0.1) is energy critical when $p = 2^\star$. The second equation in (0.1) is energy supercritical when $n \geq 5$. The Proca mass $m_1 > 0$ makes that the two equations in (0.1) are strongly coupled one with another.

The system (0.1), in Proca form, has been investigated by Druet and Hebey [24], Druet, Hebey and Vétois [27], Hebey and Truong [37], and Hebey and Wei [39] in the case of 3 and 4-dimensional manifolds (see also Hebey and Wei [40]). In these dimensions, the second equation in (0.1) is either subcritical or critical and we do have a well established variational framework for the system. When $n \geq 5$, as already mentioned, the second equation in (0.1) is supercritical. The problem comes with the $u^2 v$-term in the left had side of the equation as well as with the u^2-term in the right hand side of the equation (there holds that $2+1 > 2^\star - 1$ when $n \geq 5$, and we even have that $2 > 2^\star - 1$ when $n \geq 7$). A priori we lose a variational framework for the system in these dimensions but, as we will see in Section 1, such a variational framework can be restored thanks to the very special structure of the second equation in (0.1). Then we can ask the question of the existence of solutions of (0.1) with special variational structures, and more precisely the question of the existence of solutions with a mountain-pass structure. We investigate this question in this paper, as well as the more involved question of the existence of a priori bounds for arbitrary solutions of (0.1). The first result we prove in this paper is concerned with $p < 2^\star$. The 3-dimensional case in Theorem 0.1 below is due to Druet and Hebey [24], the 4-dimensional case to Hebey and Truong [37], and the $n \geq 5$ cases are new. As one can check, it follows from the theorem that when

the first equation in (0.1) is subcritical, then the possible supercriticality of the second equation has no importance. The notion of a smooth positive mountain-pass solution of (0.1) is defined in Section 4.

Theorem 0.1 (Subcritical case)**.** *Let (M,g) be a smooth closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 3$, $m_0, m_1, q > 0$ be positive real numbers, and $p \in (2, 2^\star)$. For any $\omega \in (-m_0, m_0)$, there exists a smooth positive mountain-pass solution (u,v) for (0.1). Moreover, there also exists $C > 0$ such that $\|u\|_{C^{2,\theta}} \leq C$ and $\|v\|_{C^{2,\theta}} \leq C$ for any positive solution (u,v) of (0.1) and all $\omega \in (-m_0, m_0)$.*

In the critical case of the first equation in (0.1) there holds that $p = 2^\star$. Then, as shown in Hebey and Wei [40], and Druet, Hebey and Vétois [27], resonant states appear in particular situations, and we cannot get a priori bounds for all phases as in Theorem 0.1. Our second result establishes that the conclusions of Theorem 0.1 are still valid when the potential m_0^2 in the first equation of (0.1) is geometrically small, despite the supercriticality of the second equation in high dimensions. The 3-dimensional case in Theorem 0.2 is due to Druet and Hebey [24], the 4-dimensional case to Hebey and Truong [37], and the $n \geq 5$ cases, as for Theorem 0.1, are new.

Theorem 0.2 (Critical case)**.** *Let (M,g) be a smooth closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 3$, $m_0, m_1, q > 0$ be positive real numbers, and $p = 2^\star$. Assume that*

$$m_0^2 < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g \tag{0.2}$$

somewhere in M, where S_g is the scalar curvature of g. Then, for any $\omega \in (-m_0, m_0)$, there exists a smooth positive mountain-pass solution (u,v) for (0.1). If we assume that (0.2) holds true everywhere in M, then there also exists $C > 0$ such that $\|u\|_{C^{2,\theta}} \leq C$ and $\|v\|_{C^{2,\theta}} \leq C$ for any positive solution (u,v) of (0.1) and all $\omega \in (-m_0, m_0)$.

In the process of the paper we also prove that the phase compensation phenomenon, established in Druet and Hebey [24] when $n = 3$, and Hebey and Truong [37] when $n = 4$, stops to hold true when $n \geq 5$ (see Corollary 2.1). In addition, we establish that the gauge potential v in (0.1) cannot be controlled in Hölder spaces $C^{0,\theta}$ if we do not get a similar control on u (see Corollary 2.2). We also discuss a model case where (0.2) is not satisfied in Proposition 9.1 but the a priori bound property remains valid.

The above two theorems prevent the full KGMP system from having standing waves solutions with arbitrarily large amplitude. Better, they claim the compactness in the C^2-topology of the set of non-negative solutions of (0.1), as the phase ω varies in $(-m_0, m_0)$.

Acknowledgements. The author warmly thanks Emmanuel Hebey for his constant support and valuable remarks at every stage of this work, and Bruno Premoselli for many helpful discussions and comments.

1. A variational setting for the second equation

Following a very nice idea due to Benci and Fortunato [6], we introduce, from the formal point of view, the auxiliary functional Φ given by

$$\Delta_g \Phi(u) + (m_1^2 + q^2 u^2)\Phi(u) = q u^2 \ . \tag{1.1}$$

The definition of $\Phi : H^1 \to H^1$ makes sense when $n = 3, 4$, as shown in Druet and Hebey [24] and Hebey and Truong [37]. Moreover, there holds in these dimensions that

$$0 \leq \Phi(u) \leq \frac{1}{q}, \quad \text{for all } u \in H^1. \tag{1.2}$$

Now we aim to give a meaning to equation (1.1) when $n \geq 5$ and to define its solution $\Phi(u)$ in some suitable sense for all $u \in H^1$. As already mentioned, (1.1) is a priori not variational anymore in H^1 when $n \geq 5$ because of the cubic term $u^2\Phi(u)$. Adapting the ideas in Hebey [36] to the closed setting, we prove that we can give a meaning to Φ when $n \geq 5$ which, as shown in Section 3, will be sufficient to get a variational characterisation of the first equation in (0.1).

Definition 1.1. *Let $u \in H^1$ be given. A function $\Phi(u) \in L^\infty \cap H^1$ is said to be a solution of (1.1) in the **restricted weak sense** if*

$$\int_M \langle \nabla\Phi, \nabla\varphi\rangle_g dv_g + \int_M (m_1^2 + q^2u^2)\Phi\varphi dv_g = q\int_M u^2\varphi dv_g, \tag{1.3}$$

for all $\varphi \in H^1 \cap L^\infty$.

When $n = 3, 4$, we can define Φ as a true variational solution of (1.1). It is then locally Lipschitz, differentiable, and its differential $D\Phi(u) = V_u$ at $u \in H^1$ is given as the unique solution of

$$\Delta_g V_u(\varphi) + \left(m_1^2 + q^2u^2\right) V_u(\varphi) = 2qu\left(1 - q\Phi(u)\right)\varphi$$

for all $\varphi \in H^1$. When $n \geq 5$, with the notion of weak solution given in Definition 1.1, we can prove that the following result holds true.

Lemma 1.1. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, q, $m_1 > 0$. There exists $\Phi : H^1 \to H^1$ such that*

$$\Delta_g\Phi(u) + (m_1^2 + q^2u^2)\Phi(u) = qu^2 \tag{1.4}$$

in the restricted weak sense, and $0 \leq \Phi(u) \leq \frac{1}{q}$ for all $u \in H^1$. Moreover, Φ is locally Hölderian continuous with coefficient $\theta_n = \min(\frac{n-2}{2(n-4)}, 1)$.

Proof of Lemma 1.1. Let $u \in H^1$ be given. Let $\Lambda > 0$ and $u_\Lambda = \min(|u|, \Lambda)$. Then $u_\Lambda \in L^\infty$ and the equation

$$\Delta_g\Phi_\Lambda(u) + (m_1^2 + q^2u_\Lambda^2)\Phi_\Lambda(u) = qu_\Lambda^2 \tag{1.5}$$

has one and only one solution $\Phi_\Lambda(u) \in H^1$. By the maximum principle, $\Phi_\Lambda(u) \geq 0$ and writing

$$\Delta_g\left(\frac{1}{q} - \Phi_\Lambda(u)\right) + (m_1^2 + q^2u_\Lambda^2)\left(\frac{1}{q} - \Phi_\Lambda(u)\right) = \frac{m_1^2}{q} > 0,$$

we get that $\Phi_\Lambda(u) \leq \frac{1}{q}$. We take now $(\Lambda_p)_p$ an increasing sequence of positive real numbers such that $\Lambda_p \to +\infty$ as $p \to +\infty$. For p, $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_g(\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u) - \Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)) + (m_1^2 + q^2u_{\Lambda_p}^2)(\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u) - \Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)) \\ &= q(u_{\Lambda_p}^2 - u_{\Lambda_t}^2)(1 - q\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

We multiply (1.6) by $\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)\in H^1$ and integrate over M. We assume first $n\geq 6$. Using a Hölder inequality, and the Sobolev inequality, we get the existence of $C>0$, independent of p and t, such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\min(m_1^2,1)\|\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)\|_{H^1}^2\\&\leq q\int_M |u_{\Lambda_p}^2-u_{\Lambda_t}^2||\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)|dv_g\\&\leq C\|u_{\Lambda_p}-u_{\Lambda_t}\|_{L^{2^\star}}\|u\|_{L^{2^\star}}\|\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)\|_{L^{2^\star/(2^\star-2)}}\\&\leq C\|u\|_{H^1}\|u_{\Lambda_p}-u_{\Lambda_t}\|_{H^1}\|\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)\|_{H^1}^{2^\star-2},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $2^\star/(2^\star-2)\geq 2^\star$ when $n\geq 6$. If we assume $n=5$, then

$$\|\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)\|_{H^1}^2 \quad\leq\quad C\|u\|_{H^1}\|u_{\Lambda_p}-u_{\Lambda_t}\|_{H^1}\|\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)-\Phi_{\Lambda_t}(u)\|_{H^1},$$

using Hölder inequality, the Sobolev embedding theorem and that M has finite volume. In any case, we get that $(\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u))_p$ is a Cauchy sequence in H^1. Hence, there exists $\Phi=\Phi(u)\in H^1$ such that

$$\Phi_{\Lambda_p}(u)\to\Phi \quad\text{in}\quad H^1\cap L^q \tag{1.7}$$

as $p\to+\infty$ for all $q\geq 1$. Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $\Phi_{\Lambda_p}\to\Phi$ a.e. In particular, $0\leq\Phi\leq\frac{1}{q}$ and by (1.5) and (1.7), we get that $\Phi(u)$ satisfies (1.4) in the restricted weak sense. There holds that $\Phi(u)$ is unique in $H^1\cap L^\infty$. Testing the equation satisfied by $\Phi(u)-\Phi(v)$ in the restricted weak sense against $\Phi(u)-\Phi(v)\in H^1\cap L^\infty$, we get the same estimates as above, namely

$$\|\Phi(u)-\Phi(v)\|_{H^1}^{1/\theta_n}\leq C(\|u\|_{H^1}+\|v\|_{H^1})\|u-v\|_{H^1}$$

for all $u,v\in H^1$, where $\theta_n=1$ if $n=5$ and $\theta_n=1/(4-2^\star)$ if $n\geq 6$. This proves Lemma 1.1. □

When $n=5$, though the problem is not variational in H^1, we can prove that $\Phi(u)$ is actually a true weak solution in H^1 of (1.4). Independently, whatever the dimension is, multiplying by $\Phi(v)-\Phi(u)$ the equation satisfied by $\Phi(v)-\Phi(u)$, and since $0\leq\Phi\leq\frac{1}{q}$, we get that

$$\|\Phi(u)-\Phi(v)\|_{H^1}^2\leq C\|u+v\|_{L^2}\|v-u\|_{L^2} \tag{1.8}$$

for all $u,v\in H^1$, where $C>0$ is independent of u and v.

2. Non smooth convergence of the gauge and loss of phase compensation in the critical case

We prove in this section that, in the model case of a bubble, the associated gauge potentials are not controlled and we loose the key equation from which phase compensation was established in Druet and Hebey [24] when $n=3$, and Hebey and Truong [37] when $n=4$. Given a converging sequence $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ of points in M, and a sequence $(\mu_\alpha)_\alpha$ of positive real numbers such that $\mu_\alpha\to 0$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$, we define the bubble of centers x_α and weights μ_α as the sequence $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ of functions given by

$$B_\alpha(x)=\left(\frac{\mu_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha^2+\frac{d_g(x_\alpha,x)^2}{n(n-2)}}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \tag{2.1}$$

for all α, and all $x \in M$, where d_g is the distance associated to g. Bubbles are constructed from the Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [12] classification of nonnegative nontrivial solutions of the critical Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star - 1}$. Any C^2 nonnegative nontrivial solution of this equation is indeed, up to translations and scaling, given by $B(x) = \left(1 + \lambda_n |x|^2\right)^{-(n-2)/2}$ for all $x \in M$, where $\lambda_n = 1/n(n-2)$. Obviously, there holds that

$$\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} B_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) = B(x) \tag{2.2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\alpha \gg 1$. The first result we prove in this section is the following.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(v_\alpha)_\alpha$ be sequences of smooth positive functions in M such that $v_\alpha = \Phi(u_\alpha)$, where Φ is as in (1.4). Let $(\mu_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of positive real numbers converging to zero, and $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a converging sequence of points in M. Assume*

$$\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \to \tilde{u}_0(x) \tag{2.3}$$

in $C^0_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $\tilde{u}_0$ is a given positive C^1-function in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\hat{v}_\alpha \to \frac{1}{q} \text{ in } L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{2.4}$$

for all $p \in [1, +\infty)$, and a.e., as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $\hat{v}_\alpha$ is the function given by $\hat{v}_\alpha(x) = v_\alpha(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. By Lemma 1.1, $0 \leq v_\alpha = \Phi(u_\alpha) \leq \frac{1}{q}$ and we only need to prove the almost everywhere convergence in (2.4). Let w_α be given by $w_\alpha = \frac{1}{q} - v_\alpha$. As for the v_α's, we have $0 \leq w_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{q}$ over M for all α. By (1.4), w_α satisfies that

$$\Delta_g w_\alpha + (m_1^2 + q^2 u_\alpha^2) w_\alpha = \frac{m_1^2}{q}.$$

Let $\delta > 0$ be small. We set for $x \in B_0(\delta/\mu_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}_\alpha(x) &= w_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right), \\ \hat{u}_\alpha(x) &= u_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right), \\ \hat{g}_\alpha(x) &= \left(\exp^\star_{x_\alpha} g\right)(\mu_\alpha x), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

so that $\hat{g}_\alpha \to \xi$ (ξ the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^n$) in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, as $\alpha \to +\infty$ and

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \hat{w}_\alpha + (m_1^2 + q^2 \hat{u}_\alpha^2) \mu_\alpha^2 \hat{w}_\alpha = \frac{m_1^2}{q} \mu_\alpha^2 \tag{2.6}$$

in $B_0(\delta/\mu_\alpha)$. Let now $R > 0$ be given. By the maximum principle, using $\hat{w}_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{q}$, (2.3), and (2.6), we get that for α large enough

$$0 \leq \hat{w}_\alpha \leq \bar{w}_\alpha, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\bar{w}_\alpha$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \bar{w}_\alpha + \frac{C_R}{\mu_\alpha^{n-4}} \bar{w}_\alpha &= \frac{m_1^2}{q} \mu_\alpha^2 \quad \text{in } B_0(R), \\ \bar{w}_\alpha &= \frac{1}{q} \quad \text{on } \partial B_0(R), \end{cases}$$

where we can choose

$$C_R = \frac{q^2}{2} \inf_{B_0(R)} \tilde{u}_0^2 > 0 \ .$$

Since R is any positive constant, it follows from (2.7) that Lemma 2.1 is proved if we get that

$$\bar{w}_\alpha \to 0 \text{ a.e. in } B_0(R/2) \tag{2.8}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. To get this result, we decompose the $\bar{w}_\alpha$'s in a quasi-harmonic part with nonzero Dirichlet boundary condition, and a quasi-Poisson part with zero Dirichlet boundary condition. More precisely, we write $\bar{w}_\alpha = \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} + \bar{w}_{2,\alpha}$, where

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} + \frac{C_R}{\mu_\alpha^{n-4}} \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} & = 0 \quad \text{in } B_0(R) \\ \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} & = \frac{1}{q} \quad \text{on } \partial B_0(R), \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \bar{w}_{2,\alpha} + \frac{C_R}{\mu_\alpha^{n-4}} \bar{w}_{2,\alpha} & = \frac{m_1^2}{q} \mu_\alpha^2 \quad \text{in } B_0(R) \\ \bar{w}_{2,\alpha} & = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_0(R). \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

Multiplying (2.10) by $\bar{w}_{2,\alpha}$, and integrating over $B_0(R)$, we get that $\bar{w}_{2,\alpha} \to 0$ in $H^1(B_0(R))$. Then, by elliptic theory, as developed in Gilbarg and Trüdinger [34], we get that

$$\bar{w}_{2,\alpha} \to 0 \text{ in } C^0\left(B_0\left(R/2\right)\right). \tag{2.11}$$

By the maximum principle, we also have that

$$0 \leq \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{q} \text{ in } B_0(R) \tag{2.12}$$

for all α. Since $n \geq 5$, $\mu_\alpha^{4-n} \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and, up to a subsequence, we can assume that the sequence $(\mu_\alpha^{4-n})_\alpha$ is increasing. Then, by the maximum principle and (2.9), for any $x \in B_0(R)$, the sequence $(\bar{w}_{1,\alpha}(x))_\alpha$ decreases. In particular, it converges to a limit $\bar{w}_1(x)$, with $0 \leq \bar{w}_1(x) \leq 1/q$. Moreover, we get from (2.9) that if φ a smooth function with compact support in $B_0(R)$, there holds :

$$\int_{B_0(R)} \left(\Delta_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \varphi + \frac{C_R}{\mu_\alpha^{n-4}} \varphi \right) \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} = 0$$

and then, using the dominated convergence theorem for $\alpha \to +\infty$ and (2.12),

$$\mu_\alpha^{4-n} \int_{B_0(R)} \varphi \bar{w}_{1,\alpha} dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} = \mu_\alpha^{4-n} \left(\int_{B_0(R)} \varphi \bar{w}_1 dv_\xi + o(1) \right) = O(1).$$

As a conclusion, since $n \geq 5$ and $\mu_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, we get that $\bar{w}_1 = 0$ a.e. in $B_0\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)$ and then, we get (2.8) using (2.11). This ends the proof of Lemma 2.1. □

As shown in Druet and Hebey [24] and Hebey and Truong [37], phase compensation holds true when $n = 3, 4$. Let Φ be as in (1.4), and $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ be as in (2.1). Since $0 \leq \Phi \leq \frac{1}{q}$, there holds that

$$0 \leq \frac{\int_M \Phi(B_\alpha) B_\alpha^2 dv_g}{\int_M B_\alpha^2 dv_g} \leq \frac{1}{q} \tag{2.13}$$

for all α. Phase compensation when $n = 3, 4$ expresses the fact that in these dimensions, the ratio in (2.13) converges to zero as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We prove in what follows that the limit of the ratio in (2.13) jumps from 0 to $\frac{1}{q}$ when $n \geq 5$ and thus that, in this sense, we lose phase compensation.

Corollary 2.1 (Loss of phase compensation)**.** *Let (M,g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$. Then, contrary to the 3 and 4-dimensional cases,*

$$\lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} \frac{\int_M \Phi(B_\alpha)B_\alpha^2 dv_g}{\int_M B_\alpha^2 dv_g} = \frac{1}{q} \ , \tag{2.14}$$

where $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ is as in (2.1), and Φ is as in (1.4).

Proof of Corollary 2.1. By (2.2) and Lemma 2.1, if we let $v_\alpha = \Phi(B_\alpha)$, and define $\hat{v}_\alpha$ to be the function given by $\hat{v}_\alpha(x) = v_\alpha(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $\hat{v}_\alpha \to \frac{1}{q}$ in $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a.e. as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In particular, we can write by the dominated convergence theorem that for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M v_\alpha B_\alpha^2 dv_g &= \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta)} v_\alpha B_\alpha^2 dv_g + O(\mu_\alpha^{n-2}), \\ &= \mu_\alpha^2 \int_{B_0(\delta/\mu_\alpha)} \hat{v}_\alpha B^2 dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} + o(\mu_\alpha^2), \\ &= \frac{\mu_\alpha^2}{q} \int_{B_0(\delta/\mu_\alpha)} B^2 dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} + o(\mu_\alpha^2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where B is as in (2.2), and $\hat{g}_\alpha$ is as in (2.5). Independently,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M B_\alpha^2 dv_g &= \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta)} B_\alpha^2 dv_g + O(\mu_\alpha^{n-2}), \\ &= \mu_\alpha^2 \int_{B_0(\delta/\mu_\alpha)} B^2 dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} + o(\mu_\alpha^2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

and we get (2.14) by combining (2.15) and (2.16). This ends the proof of Corollary 2.1. □

We prove now that in the critical case of (0.1), when $n \geq 5$, we cannot hope for a C^1, and even a C^0, convergence of the potentials in the leading equation of (0.1) when dealing with blowing-up sequences of solutions (u_α, v_α) of such systems. More precisely, we let u_α and v_α be smooth positive functions such that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u_\alpha + m_0^2 u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star-1} + \omega_\alpha^2(1-qv_\alpha)^2 u_\alpha \\ \Delta_g v_\alpha + (m_1^2 + q^2 u_\alpha^2)v_\alpha = q u_\alpha^2 \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

for all α, where $(\omega_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a converging sequence in $(-m_0, +m_0)$. We assume that $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in H^1. When $n = 3$, elliptic theory gives that $(v_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in $C^{0,\theta}$ for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, and thus, up to a subsequence, the v_α's converge in C^0 as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We claim that the convergence stops to hold true when $n \geq 5$.

Corollary 2.2 (Non C^0-convergence of the v_α's)**.** *Let (M,g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, $(\omega_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a converging sequence in $(-m_0, +m_0)$, and $u_\alpha, v_\alpha > 0$ be smooth positive functions satsifying (2.17) for all α. Assume that $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in H^1, and that $\|u_\alpha\|_{L^\infty} \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then there are no subsequences of $(v_\alpha)_\alpha$ which converge in C^0.*

Proof of Corollary 2.2. We assume by contradiction that, up to a passing to a subsequence, $v_\alpha \to v$ in C^0. The sequence $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in H^1 and, by (2.17), it satisfies an equation like

$$\Delta_g u_\alpha + h_\alpha u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star-1} \ ,$$

where $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$ converges in L^∞. In particular, the H^1-theory of Struwe [49] applies, see also Hebey [35] for an exposition in book form in this particular context, and we get that

$$u_\alpha = u_\infty + \sum_{i=1}^{k} B_\alpha^i + R_\alpha \tag{2.18}$$

for all α, where $u_\infty \in H^1$ is a weak solution of $\Delta_g u + hu = u^{2^\star - 1}$, $h = \lim h_\alpha$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the $(B_\alpha^i)_\alpha$'s are bubbles as in (2.1), and $R_\alpha \to 0$ in H^1 as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By the Trüdinger [50] regularity theory, $u_\infty \in H_2^p$ for all $p \geq 1$. By the second equation in (2.17), the sequence $(v_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in H^1. Up to passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_\alpha \to u_\infty$ in $L^{2+\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, and that $v_\alpha \rightharpoonup v$ in H^1. Then we get that v solves

$$\Delta_g v + (m_1^2 + q^2 u_\infty^2) v = q u_\infty^2$$

and by regularity theory, v is C^3. If x_0 is a point where v is maximum, $\Delta_g v(x_0) \geq 0$, and we thus get that

$$v \leq \frac{q u_\infty(x_0)^2}{m_1^2 + q^2 u_\infty(x_0)^2} \ . \tag{2.19}$$

The assumption $\|u_\alpha\|_{L^\infty} \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ and an adaptation of the Trüdinger argument [50] imply that $k \in \mathbb{N}^\star$ in (2.18). Let $\mu_\alpha = \min_i \mu_{i,\alpha}$, where the $\mu_{i,\alpha}$'s are the weights of the bubbles in (2.18). Up to renumbering, and up to passing to a subsequence, we can assume that $\mu_\alpha = \mu_{1,\alpha}$ for all α. We let the x_α's be the centers of the bubble $(B_\alpha^1)_\alpha$. By rescaling arguments, proceeding as in Proposition 7.1 in Hebey [35],

$$\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)) \to B(x) \tag{2.20}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where B is as in (2.2). By (2.20) we can apply Lemma 2.1. In particular, we get that if x_1 is the limit of the x_α's, then $v(x_1) = \frac{1}{q}$, a contradiction with (2.19) which implies that $v < \frac{1}{q}$ everywhere in M. This ends the proof of Corollary 2.2. □

A typical example where Corollary 2.2 applies is when $(M, g) = (S^n, g)$ is the unit n-sphere, $\omega_\alpha = 0$ for all α, $v_\alpha = \Phi(u_\alpha)$, where Φ is as in (1.4), $m_0^2 = \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$, and

$$u_\alpha(x) = \left(\frac{n(n-2)}{4} (\beta_\alpha^2 - 1) \right)^{\frac{n-2}{4}} (\beta_\alpha - \cos(d_g(x_0, x)))^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \tag{2.21}$$

for all α, some $x_0 \in S^n$, and β_α's such that $\beta_\alpha > 1$ for all α, and $\beta_\alpha \to 1$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$.

3. Differentiablity of the auxiliary energy

We return in this section to the map Φ we constructed in (1.4) and prove that despite the fact that Φ is not a priori differentiable, the map $\Psi : H^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\Psi(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M (1 - q\Phi(u))\, u^2 dv_g \tag{3.1}$$

is C^1 with a nice differential given by the jumping of the square power on u to a square power on $1 - q\Phi(u)$. More precisely, we prove that the following lemma holds true.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (M,g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$. Let also q, $m_1 > 0$, $\Phi : H^1 \to H^1$ be as in (1.4), and $\Psi : H^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by (3.1). Then Ψ is C^1 in H^1 and*

$$D\Psi(u).(\varphi) = \int_M (1 - q\Phi(u))^2 u\varphi dv_g \tag{3.2}$$

for all $u, \varphi \in H^1$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. It suffices to discuss the differentiability of

$$\Psi_R(u) = \int_M u^2 \Phi(u) dv_g \ .$$

We compute

$$\Psi_R(u+\varphi) = \int_M u^2 \Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g + 2\int_M u\varphi\Phi(u) dv_g + o(\|\varphi\|_{H^1}) \tag{3.3}$$

since, using Hölder inequality, and the inequality $0 \leq \Phi \leq 1/q$, there holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_M |u\varphi(\Phi(u+\varphi) - \Phi(u))| dv_g \\
&\leq \|u\|_{L^{2^\star}} \|\varphi\|_{L^{2^\star}} \|\Phi(u+\varphi) - \Phi(u)\|_{L^{\frac{2^\star}{2^\star-2}}} \\
&\leq C\|u\|_{L^{2^\star}} \|\varphi\|_{L^{2^\star}} \|\Phi(u+\varphi) - \Phi(u)\|_{L^{2^\star}} \text{ if } 5 \leq n \leq 6, \\
&\leq C\|u\|_{L^{2^\star}} \|\varphi\|_{L^{2^\star}} \|\Phi(u+\varphi) - \Phi(u)\|_{L^{2^\star}}^{2^\star-2} \text{ if } n \geq 7.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Testing the equations satisfied by $\Phi(u)$ and $\Phi(u+\varphi)$ in the restricted weak sense against $\Phi(u+\varphi)$ and $\Phi(u) \in L^\infty \cap H^1$, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_M \langle \nabla\Phi(u), \nabla\Phi(u+\varphi)\rangle dv_g + m_1^2 \int_M \Phi(u)\Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g \\
&+ q^2 \int_M u^2 \Phi(u)\Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g = q\int_M u^2 \Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_M \langle \nabla\Phi(u), \nabla\Phi(u+\varphi)\rangle dv_g + m_1^2 \int_M \Phi(u)\Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g \\
&+ q^2 \int_M \Phi(u+\varphi)\Phi(u)(u^2+2u\varphi) dv_g = q\int_M \Phi(u)(u^2+2u\varphi) dv_g + o(\|\varphi\|_{H^1}) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

We eliminate the gradient terms in these two equations and get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M u^2\Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g =& \Psi_R(u) + 2\int_M \varphi u\Phi(u)\left(1 - q\Phi(u)\right) dv_g \\
&+ 2q\int_M \Phi(u)u\varphi(\Phi(u) - \Phi(u+\varphi)) dv_g + o(\|\varphi\|_{H^1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in (3.4), it follows from the Sobolev inequality that

$$\int_M u^2\Phi(u+\varphi) dv_g = \Psi_R(u) + 2\int_M u\varphi\Phi(u)(1 - q\Phi(u)) dv_g + o(\|\varphi\|_{H^1}).$$

Using now (3.3), we get

$$\Psi(u+\varphi) = \Psi(u) + \int_M (1 - q\Phi(u))^2 u\varphi dv_g + o(\|\varphi\|_{H^1})$$

for $u, \varphi \in H^1$, and (3.2) holds true. The continuity of $D\Psi$ easily follows from the continuity of Φ. Lemma 3.1 is proved. □

4. Existence of mountain pass solutions

Formally, solutions of (0.1) are critical points of the functional S defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S(u,v) =& \frac{1}{2}\int_M |\nabla u|^2 dv_g - \frac{\omega^2}{2}\int_M |\nabla v|^2 dv_g + \frac{m_0^2}{2}\int_M u^2 dv_g \\ & - \frac{\omega^2 m_1^2}{2}\int_M v^2 dv_g - \frac{1}{2^\star}\int_M u^p dv_g - \frac{\omega^2}{2}\int_M u^2(1-qv)^2 dv_g. \end{aligned}$$

We face here two major difficulties : the functional S is strongly indefinite (because of the competition between u and v) and it does not make sense for all $u, v \in H^1$ when $n \geq 5$ (since then $2^\star < 4$). For instance, the expression $\int_M u^2 v^2 dv_g$ of the last term of S does not make sense for all $u, v \in H^1$. We let Φ be defined as in (1.4) and introduce the functional $I : H^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} I(u) =& \frac{1}{2}\int_M |\nabla u|^2 dv_g + \frac{m_0^2}{2}\int_M u^2 dv_g \\ & - \frac{1}{p}\int_M (u^+)^p dv_g - \frac{\omega^2}{2}\int_M (1-q\Phi(u))u^2 dv_g \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $u^+ = \max(u, 0)$, and $p \in (2, 2^\star]$. The functional makes sense in any dimension since $0 \leq \Phi \leq \frac{1}{q}$, it is C^1 by Lemma 3.1, and still by Lemma 3.1, if u is a nonnegative critical point of I, then $(u, \Phi(u))$ solves (0.1). We define a mountain pass solution in Definition 4.1 below. The mountain-pass lemma we refer to in this definition is the one given in Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [1].

Definition 4.1. *A couple (u, v) is a **mountain-pass solution** of (0.1) if $u \in H^1$, $v = \Phi(u)$, with Φ given in Lemma 1.1, and u is obtained from I, defined in (4.1), by the mountain-pass lemma from 0 to $u_1 \in H^1$, where $I(u_1) < 0$.*

When $p \in (2, 2^\star)$ the existence part in Theorem 0.1 very easily follows from the mountain pass lemma of Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [1] and the compactness of the embedding $H^1 \subset L^p$. We very briefly discuss the proof in what follows.

Proof of the existence part in Theorem 0.1. By Lemma 3.1, the function I defined by (4.1) is C^1 in H^1 . Obviously, since $p > 2$, and since $0 \leq \Phi \leq \frac{1}{q}$ and $\omega^2 < m_0^2$, there exist $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$, $\rho_1 \ll 1$, such that $I(u) \geq \rho_2$ for all $u \in H^1$ satisfying that $\|u\|_{H^1} = \rho_1$. Let $\bar{u}_0 \in H^1$, $\bar{u}_0^+ \not\equiv 0$ and $T_0 \gg 1$ be such that $I(T_0\bar{u}_0) < 0$. Since $I(0) = 0$ and $I(T_0\bar{u}_0) < 0$, we can apply the mountain-pass lemma of Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [1], and we get that there exists a Palais-Smale sequence $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ at level

$$c = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{u \in \gamma} I(u) \ ,$$

where Γ stands for the set of continuous paths from 0 to $T_0\bar{u}_0$. Writing that $DI(u_\alpha).(u_\alpha^-) = o\left(\|u_\alpha^-\|_{H^1}\right)$, we get that $u_\alpha^- \to 0$ in H^1 as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Following the classical scheme in Brézis and Nirenberg [11], it follows that the sequence $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in H^1. By the Rellich-Kondrakov theorem, passing to a subsequence, we get that there exists $u \in H^1$ such that $u_\alpha \rightharpoonup u$ in H^1, $u_\alpha \to u$ in L^p, and $u_\alpha \to u$ a.e. By (1.8), $\Phi(u_\alpha) \to \Phi(u)$ in H^1, and we conclude with very standard arguments

that $(u, \Phi(u))$ is the mountain pass solution we look for. This ends the proof of the existence part in Theorem 0.1. □

In the critical case where $p = 2^\star$, the above proof needs to be refined. The following result follows from applying the mountain pass lemma of Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [1] together with arguments from Aubin [2] and Brézis and Nirenberg [11]. We let K_n be the sharp constant for the standard Euclidean Sobolev inequality $\|u\|_{L^{2^\star}} \leq K_n \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}$ with $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The explicit value of K_n is known and given by $n(n-2)\omega_n^{2/n} K_n^2 = 4$, where ω_n is the volume of the unit n-sphere S^n endowed with its canonical metric. A compact version of this sharp inequality is in Hebey and Vaugon [38].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\bar{u}_0 \in H^1$, $\bar{u}_0^+ \not\equiv 0$, and $T_0 \gg 1$ be such that $I(T_0 \bar{u}_0) < 0$. Let $p = 2^\star$ and*

$$c = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{u \in \gamma} I(u) \ , \tag{4.2}$$

where Γ stands for the set of continuous paths from 0 to $T_0 \bar{u}_0$. Assume that

$$c < \frac{1}{n K_n^n} \ . \tag{4.3}$$

Then there exists a smooth mountain-pass solution (u, v) of (0.1), with u, $v > 0$ in M.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. First, we apply the mountain-pass lemma to get u. By Lemma 3.1, the function I defined by (4.1) is C^1 in H^1 . Obviously, since $p > 2$, and since $0 \leq \Phi \leq \frac{1}{q}$ and $\omega^2 < m_0^2$, there exist $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$, $\rho_1 \ll 1$, such that $I(u) \geq \rho_2$ for all $u \in H^1$ satisfying that $\|u\|_{H^1} = \rho_1$. Since $I(0) = 0$ and $I(T_0 \bar{u}_0) < 0$, we can apply the mountain-pass lemma of Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [1], and we get that there exists a sequence $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ of functions in H^1 such that

$$I(u_\alpha) \to c, \tag{4.4}$$

$$DI(u_\alpha) \to 0 \text{ in } (H^1)', \tag{4.5}$$

$$DI(u_\alpha).(u_\alpha) = o(\|u_\alpha\|_{H^1}), \tag{4.6}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where c is as in (4.2). Applying (4.5) to the (u_α^-)'s and using $\omega^2 < m_0^2$, we get that

$$u_\alpha^- \to 0 \text{ in } H^1 \tag{4.7}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Using (4.7), $0 \leq \Phi(u_\alpha) \leq 1/q$, the Sobolev and Hölder inequalities, we get combining (4.4) and (4.6) that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^\star}\right) \int_M |u_\alpha|^{2^\star} dv_g = c + o(1) + o(\|u_\alpha\|_{H^1}) + O\left(\|u_\alpha\|_{L^{2^\star}}^2\right).$$

As a consequence, we get $\|u_\alpha\|_{L^{2^\star}} \leq C + o(\|u_\alpha\|_{H^1})$ for $C > 0$ independent of α, and then

$$\|u_\alpha\|_{H^1} = O(1) \tag{4.8}$$

by using (4.6), (4.7) and $m_0^2 > \omega^2$ again. Up to a subsequence, there exists $u \in H^1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &u_\alpha \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly in } H^1, \\ &u_\alpha \to u \text{ in } L^2, \\ &u_\alpha \to u \text{ and } (u_\alpha^+) \to (u^+) \text{ a.e.} \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Thus, by (4.7), we have $u \geq 0$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem and (4.8), the sequence $((u_\alpha^+)^{2^\star-1})_\alpha$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{2^\star}{2^\star-1}}$ and by (4.9), we get $(u_\alpha^+)^{2^\star-1} \rightharpoonup u^{2^\star-1}$, weakly in $L^{\frac{2^\star}{2^\star-1}}$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, using (1.8), (3.2) and (4.9), letting α go to $+\infty$ in (4.5), we get that for any $\varphi \in H^1$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_M \langle \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle_g dv_g + m_0^2 \int_M u\varphi dv_g \\ &= \int_M u^{2^\star-1}\varphi dv_g + \omega^2 \int_M u(1-q\Phi(u))^2 \varphi dv_g, \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where u is as in (4.9). In other words, u satisfies the first equation of (0.1) in a weak sense. It remains to prove that $u \not\equiv 0$. We assume by contradiction that $u \equiv 0$. By (4.8), up to a subsequence, we can assume that for some $t \geq 0$,

$$\int_M |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dv_g \to t \tag{4.11}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, using (4.6), (4.7), $0 \leq \Phi(u_\alpha) \leq 1/q$ and (4.9), we can write

$$\int_M u_\alpha^{2^\star} dv_g \to t \tag{4.12}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Using now (4.3) and (4.4), we have

$$0 < \frac{t}{n} = c < \frac{1}{nK_n^n}, \tag{4.13}$$

where t is as in (4.11) and (4.12). On the other hand, keeping in mind that $u \equiv 0$ and writing the optimal Sobolev inequality in Hebey and Vaugon [38] for the u_α's, we get

$$t^{\frac{2}{2^\star}} \leq K_n^2 t \ . \tag{4.14}$$

In particular, we get a contradiction with (4.13). This proves that $u \not\equiv 0$. General regularity results as in Gilbarg and Trüdinger [34], the Trüdinger [50] critical regularity result, and the maximum principle then apply. In particular, u and $v = \Phi(u)$ are smooth, positive in M, and they satisfy (0.1). This proves Lemma 4.1. □

We use now the test functions introduced by Aubin [2]. Given $x_0 \in M$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho_0 > 0$, we define, for $x \in M$, the function u_ε by

$$\begin{cases} u_\varepsilon(x) = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} - \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2+\rho_0^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} & \text{if } r \leq \rho_0, \\ u_\varepsilon(x) = 0 & \text{if } r \geq \rho_0, \end{cases} \tag{4.15}$$

where $r = d_g(x, x_0)$ is the geodesic distance induced in M by the metric g. Then, computing as in Aubin [2], for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$I_\lambda(u_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{K_n^2}\left(1 - C_1\left(\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g(x_0) - \lambda\right)\varepsilon^2 + o(\varepsilon^2)\right) \text{ for } n \geq 5, \tag{4.16}$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$, where

$$I_\lambda(u) = \frac{\int_M (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda u^2) dv_g}{(\int_M |u|^{2^\star})^{2/2^\star}} \tag{4.17}$$

for $u \in H^1\backslash\{0\}$, and $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are independent of ε. There also holds

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M u_\varepsilon^{2^\star} dv_g &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{1+|x|^2}\right)^n dx + o(1), \\ \int_M |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dv_g &= n(n-2)\int_M u_\varepsilon^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We are now in position to prove the existence part in Theorem 0.2.

Proof of the existence part in Theorem 0.2. By Druet and Hebey [24] and Hebey and Truong [37], we only need to address the case $n \geq 5$. By (0.2), we can choose $x_0 \in M$ such that

$$m_0^2 < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g(x_0). \tag{4.19}$$

Let $(\varepsilon_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\varepsilon_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, $u_\alpha = u_{\varepsilon_\alpha}$, where u_{ε_α} is given in (4.15), and $\mathcal{H}$ be the functional defined in H^1 by

$$\mathcal{H}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_M |\nabla u|^2 dv_g + \frac{m_0^2}{2}\int_M u^2 dv_g - \frac{1}{2^\star}\int_M |u|^{2^\star} dv_g. \tag{4.20}$$

By (4.18), there exists $T_0 \gg 1$ such that $I(T_0 u_\alpha) < 0$ for all $\alpha \gg 1$, where I is as in (4.1). Using (4.16), we can choose α sufficiently large to have, setting $\bar{u}_0 = u_\alpha$,

$$I_{m_0^2}(\bar{u}_0) < \frac{1}{K_n^2}, \tag{4.21}$$

where $I_{m_0^2}$ is given in (4.17). There holds that

$$\max_{0\leq t\leq T_0} I(t\bar{u}_0) \leq \max_{0\leq t\leq T_0} \mathcal{H}(t\bar{u}_0) \leq \frac{1}{n} I_{m_0^2}(\bar{u}_0)^{\frac{n}{2}} < \frac{1}{nK_n^n}, \tag{4.22}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is defined in (4.20). We get the first inequality since $\bar{u}_0$ is non-negative and $0 \leq \Phi(\bar{u}_0) \leq \frac{1}{q}$ (Lemma 1.1), the second one comes from maximizing the function $t \mapsto \mathcal{H}(t\bar{u}_0)$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and the last one is given by (4.21). In particular, Lemma 4.1 applies, and this ends the proof of the existence part in Theorem 0.2. □

Existence of solutions and semiclassical limits for systems like (0.1), in Euclidean space, have been investigated by D'Aprile and Mugnai [16, 15], D'Aprile and Wei [17, 18], D'Avenia and Pisani [19], D'Avenia, Pisani and Siciliano [21, 20], Azzollini, Pisani and Pomponio [3], Azzollini and Pomponio [4], Benci and Bonanno [5], Benci and Fortunato [7, 8, 9, 10], Cassani [13], Georgiev and Visciglia [31] and Mugnai [45, 46].

5. A Priori bounds in the subcritical case

Let (ω_α) be a sequence in $(-m_0, m_0)$ such that $\omega_\alpha \to \omega$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some $\omega \in [-m_0, m_0]$. Also let $p \in (2, 2^\star)$ and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (0.1) with phase ω_α. Then,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u_\alpha + m_0^2 u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{p-1} + \omega_\alpha^2 (1 - q v_\alpha)^2 u_\alpha, \\ \Delta_g v_\alpha + (m_1^2 + q^2 u_\alpha^2) v_\alpha = q u_\alpha^2, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

for all α. By the Lemma 1.1, $0 \leq v_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{q}$ for all α. Assume by contradiction that

$$\max_M u_\alpha \to +\infty \tag{5.2}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Let $x_\alpha \in M$ and $\mu_\alpha > 0$ given by

$$u_\alpha(x_\alpha) = \max_M u_\alpha = \mu_\alpha^{-\frac{2}{(p-2)}}.$$

By (5.2), $\mu_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Define $\tilde{u}_\alpha$ by

$$\tilde{u}_\alpha(x) = \mu_\alpha^{\frac{2}{p-2}} u_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)$$

and g_α by $g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}^\star g\right)(\mu_\alpha x)$ for $x \in B_0(\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1})$, where $\delta > 0$ is small. Since $\mu_\alpha \to 0$, we get that $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Moreover, by (5.1)

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha}\tilde{u}_\alpha + \mu_\alpha^2 m_0^2 \tilde{u}_\alpha = \tilde{u}_\alpha^{p-1} + \mu_\alpha^2\omega_\alpha^2(1 - q\hat{v}_\alpha)^2\tilde{u}_\alpha \ , \tag{5.3}$$

where $\hat{v}_\alpha$ is given by $\hat{v}_\alpha(x) = v_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)$. We have $\tilde{u}_\alpha(0) = 1$ and $0 \leq \tilde{u}_\alpha \leq 1$. By (5.3) and standard elliptic theory arguments, we can write that, after passing to a subsequence, $\tilde{u}_\alpha \to u$ in $C^{1,\theta}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, where u is such that $u(0) = 1$ and $0 \leq u \leq 1$. Then,

$$\Delta u = u^{p-1}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^n$, where Δ is the Euclidean Laplacian. It follows that u is actually smooth and positive, and, since $2 < p < 2^\star$, we get a contradiction with the Liouville result of Gidas and Spruck [33]. As a conclusion, (5.2) is not possible and there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$u_\alpha + v_\alpha \leq C \tag{5.4}$$

in M for all α. Coming back to (5.1), it follows that the sequences $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(v_\alpha)_\alpha$ are actually bounded in $H^{2,s}$ for all s. Classical subcritical bootstrap argument and the Sobolev embeddings give that they are also bounded in $C^{2,\tilde{\theta}}$, $0 < \tilde{\theta} < 1$. This ends the proof of the uniform bounds in Theorem 0.1.

6. Blow-up theory in the critical case - Bounded potentials.

In what follows, we let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, $m_0, m_1, q > 0$, and $(\omega_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence in $(-m_0, m_0)$ such that $\omega_\alpha \to \omega$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some $\omega \in [-m_0, m_0]$. Also, we let $\left((u_\alpha, v_\alpha)\right)_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (0.1) in the critical case $p = 2^\star$ with phases ω_α. Namely

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u_\alpha + m_0^2 u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} + \omega_\alpha^2(1 - qv_\alpha)^2 u_\alpha, \\ \Delta_g v_\alpha + (m_1^2 + q^2 u_\alpha^2)v_\alpha = qu_\alpha^2, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

for all α. Recall that we have a uniform bound in L^∞ for the v_α's, to be more precise $0 \leq v_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{q}$ for all α. In particular, if we let

$$h_\alpha = m_0^2 - \omega_\alpha^2(qv_\alpha - 1)^2 \ , \tag{6.2}$$

then $\|h_\alpha\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$ for all α, where $C > 0$ is independent of α. We assume here that

$$\max_M u_\alpha \to +\infty \tag{6.3}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, a priori, see Corollary 2.2, the h_α's do not converge in L^∞. We let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of points in M and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of positive

real numbers, with $0 < \rho_\alpha < i_g/7$, where i_g is the injectivity radius of (M, g). We assume that the x_α's and ρ_α's satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \nabla u_\alpha(x_\alpha) = 0 \text{ for all } \alpha, \\ d_g(x_\alpha, x)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha(x) \leq C \text{ for all } x \in B_{x_\alpha}(7\rho_\alpha) \text{ and all } \alpha, \\ \lim_{\alpha \to +\infty} \rho_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sup_{B_{x_\alpha}(6\rho_\alpha)} u_\alpha = +\infty. \end{cases} \tag{6.4}$$

We let μ_α be given by

$$\mu_\alpha = u_\alpha(x_\alpha)^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} \tag{6.5}$$

and let u_0 be given by

$$u_0(x) = \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{|x|^2}{n(n-2)}} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \tag{6.6}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The u_α's satisfy the stationary Schrödinger equation

$$\Delta_g u_\alpha + h_\alpha u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} \tag{6.7}$$

for all α, where h_α is as in (6.2), and by Lemma 1.1, as already mentioned, there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|h_\alpha\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$ for all α. The L^∞-bound on the potentials in (6.7) makes that we can apply the C^0-estimates proved in Chapter 6 of the book of Hebey [35] (see Druet [22], Druet, Hebey, Robert [26], Druet, Hebey and Vétois [28], Li-Zhu [42], and Li-Zhang [41, 43, 44] for original references). In particular, Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 6.1 below hold true. First we state Lemma 6.1.

Lemma 6.1 (See Hebey [35])**.** *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of* (6.1)*, such that* (6.3) *holds true. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be such that* (6.4) *holds true. After passing to a subsequence*

$$\frac{\rho_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha} \to +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_\alpha \to 0 \tag{6.8}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where μ_α is given by (6.5)*, and*

$$\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha .) \right) \to u_0, \tag{6.9}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where u_0 is given by (6.6)*.*

In order to state Proposition 6.1 we need to introduce the range r_α attached to the u_α's. We define $\varphi_\alpha : [0, \rho_\alpha) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\varphi_\alpha(r) = \frac{1}{|\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r)|} \int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r)} u_\alpha d\sigma_g \tag{6.10}$$

where $|\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r)|$ is the volume of the geodesic sphere of center x_α. As a consequence of Lemma 6.1, we have that

$$(\mu_\alpha r)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \varphi(\mu_\alpha r) \to \left(\frac{r}{1 + \frac{r^2}{n(n-2)}} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \tag{6.11}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then we define $r_\alpha \in [2R_0\mu_\alpha, \rho_\alpha]$ by

$$r_\alpha = \sup \left\{ r \in [2R_0\mu_\alpha, \rho_\alpha] \quad s.t. \left(s^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \varphi_\alpha(s) \right)' \leq 0 \text{ in } [2R_0\mu_\alpha, r] \right\}, \tag{6.12}$$

where $R_0^2 = n(n-2)$. Thanks to (6.11), we have that

$$\frac{r_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha} \to +\infty \tag{6.13}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, while the definition of r_α gives that

$$r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\varphi_\alpha \text{ is non-increasing in } [2R_0\mu_\alpha, r_\alpha] \tag{6.14}$$

and that

$$\left(r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\varphi_\alpha(r)\right)'(r_\alpha) = 0 \text{ if } r_\alpha < \rho_\alpha. \tag{6.15}$$

Proposition 6.1 gives sharp pointwise estimates on the u_α's at a distance like r_α of x_α (an infinitesimal version of the C^0-estimates in Druet, Hebey and Robert [26]).

Proposition 6.1 (See Hebey [35])**.** *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (6.1), such that (6.3) holds true. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be such that (6.4) holds true. Let $R > 0$ be such that $Rr_\alpha \leq 6\rho_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \gg 1$. There exist $C > 0$ and $(\varepsilon_\alpha)_\alpha$ a sequence of positive real numbers such that, after passing to a subsequence,*

$$\begin{aligned} &u_\alpha(x) + d_g(x_\alpha, x)|\nabla u_\alpha(x)| \leq C\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} d_g(x_\alpha, x)^{2-n}, \\ &|u_\alpha(x) - B_\alpha(x)| \leq C\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\left(r_\alpha^{2-n} + d_g(x_\alpha, x)^{3-n}\right) + \varepsilon_\alpha B_\alpha(x), \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

for all $x \in B_{x_\alpha}\left(\frac{R}{2}r_\alpha\right)\setminus\{x_\alpha\}$ and all α, where μ_α is as in (6.5), r_α as in (6.12), $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ as in (2.1), and $\varepsilon_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$.

We refer to Hebey [35] for the proofs of Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 6.1. Now we aim in applying to our situation the classical scheme for stability, as developed in Druet [22] (see also Hebey [35]), but face the serious difficulty that, contrary to what is a priori required by this scheme, and as discussed in Section 2, we do not have any C^1-control on the v_α's, and thus on the h_α's in (6.7). The loss of sufficiently smooth control may of course reverse the stability issue and transform an a priori stable situation into an unstable situation (see Druet and Laurain [29] or Druet, Hebey and Laurain [25] for results in this direction). We settle this loss of control on the derivatives in the next section thanks to the very special form of the equations in (0.1) and the idea developed in Lemma 2.1.

7. Blow-up theory in the critical case - Sharp asymptotics

Once more we let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, $m_0, m_1, q > 0$, and $(\omega_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence in $(-m_0, m_0)$ such that $\omega_\alpha \to \omega$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some $\omega \in [-m_0, m_0]$. Also, we let $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive functions satisfying (6.1) for all α, and satisfying (6.3). At last we let the x_α's and ρ_α's be points in M and positive real numbers which satisfy (6.4). We continue the a priori asymptotic analysis of the blowing-up sequence $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ around the theoretical concentration points x_α we initiated in the preceding section. We let μ_α be given by (6.5) and define $\hat{v}_\alpha$ to be such that

$$\hat{v}_\alpha(x) = v_\alpha(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x))$$

for $x \in B_0(\rho_\alpha/\mu_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. By Lemma 6.1, we can apply Lemma 2.1. In particular we get that the following result holds true.

Lemma 7.1. *For any $p \in [1, +\infty[$,*

$$\hat{v}_\alpha \to \frac{1}{q} \text{ in } L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{7.1}$$

and a.e. as $\alpha \to +\infty$.

Now we aim to get asymptotic formulas for the u_α's at the scale of the r_α's. Here we use assumption (0.2) for the first time. The following proposition is the key result of this section.

Proposition 7.1. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (6.1) such that (6.3) holds true. We assume (0.2) holds true everywhere in M. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be such that (6.4) holds true. Then $r_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$,*

$$r_\alpha = \rho_\alpha \tag{7.2}$$

for all α, and

$$r_\alpha^{n-2} \mu_\alpha^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha x)\right) \to \frac{(n(n-2))^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{|x|^{n-2}} + \mathcal{H}(x) \tag{7.3}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(B_0(2)\backslash\{0\})$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where μ_α is as in (6.5), r_α as in (6.12), and $\mathcal{H}$ is a harmonic function in $B_0(2)$ which satisfies that $\mathcal{H}(0) \leq 0$.

In order to prove Proposition 7.1, we let X_α be the 1-form given by

$$X_\alpha(x) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{6(n-1)} Rc_g^\sharp(x)(\nabla f_\alpha(x), \nabla f_\alpha(x))\right) \nabla f_\alpha(x) \tag{7.4}$$

for $x \in M$, where $f_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{2} d_g(x_\alpha, x)^2$, Rc_g is the Ricci curvature tensor of g, and $\sharp$ is the musical isomorphism. As is easily checked, the following estimates hold true

$$\begin{aligned} &|X_\alpha(x)| = O(d_g(x_\alpha, x)), \\ &\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha(x) = n + O(d_g(x_\alpha, x)^2), \\ &\Delta_g(\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)(x) = \frac{n}{n-1} S_g(x) + O(d_g(x_\alpha, x)). \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

We define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha = \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} (q v_\alpha - 1)^2 \left\{ u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha) + \frac{n-2}{2n} (\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha) u_\alpha^2 \right\} dv_g, \tag{7.6}$$

where, for a 1-form X and a smooth function u, $X(\nabla u) = (X, \nabla u) = g^{ij} X_i \nabla_j u$ in local coordinates. The Riemannian Pohozaev identity given in Hebey [35], when applied to u_α in $B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)$, gives that

$$\begin{aligned} &m_0^2 \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \left\{ u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha) + \frac{n-2}{2n} (\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha) u_\alpha^2 \right\} dv_g \\ &+ \frac{n-2}{4n} \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} (\Delta_g \mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)\, u_\alpha^2 dv_g = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha + Q_{1,\alpha} - Q_{2,\alpha} + Q_{3,\alpha}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha$ is as in (7.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{1,\alpha} =& \frac{n-2}{2n}\int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} (\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)(\partial_\nu u_\alpha) u_\alpha d\sigma_g \\
&- \int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \left(\frac{1}{2} X_\alpha(\nu) |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 - X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha)\partial_\nu u_\alpha \right) d\sigma_g, \\
Q_{2,\alpha} =& \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \left(\nabla X_\alpha - \frac{1}{n}(\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha) g \right)^\sharp (\nabla u_\alpha, \nabla u_\alpha) dv_g, \\
Q_{3,\alpha} =& \frac{n-2}{2n}\int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} X_\alpha(\nu) u_\alpha^{2^\star} d\sigma_g \\
&- \frac{n-2}{4n}\int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \left(\partial_\nu(\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)\right) u_\alpha^2 d\sigma_g,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

and, in the above expressions, ν is the unit outward normal to $\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)$. We need two intermediate lemmas before proving Proposition 7.1. The first lemma is as follows.

Lemma 7.2. *Let (M,g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (6.1) such that (6.3) holds true. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be such that (6.4) holds true. Let r_α be as in (6.12), μ_α as in (6.5), X_α as in (7.4), and $\bar{x}_0$ be such that, up to a subsequence, $x_\alpha \to \bar{x}_0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha$ be as in (7.6). Then there holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha = o(\mu_\alpha^2) \tag{7.9}$$

and we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \left\{ u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha) + \frac{n-2}{2n}(div_g X_\alpha) u_\alpha^2 \right\} dv_g = \mu_\alpha^2 \left(-C_n + o(1) \right), \\
&\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} (\Delta_g div_g X_\alpha)\, u_\alpha^2 dv_g = \mu_\alpha^2 \left(\frac{n S_g(\bar{x}_0)}{n-1} C_n + o(1) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

where $C_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^2 dx$, u_0 is as in (6.6), and S_g is the scalar curvature of g.

Proof of Lemma 7.2. For $x \in B_0(\rho_\alpha/\mu_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we let

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{u}_\alpha(x) &= u_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right), \\
\hat{v}_\alpha(x) &= v_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right), \\
\hat{\varphi}_\alpha(x) &= \mathrm{div}_g(X_\alpha)\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right), \\
\hat{\psi}_\alpha(x) &= (X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha))\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right), \\
\hat{g}_\alpha(x) &= \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}^\star g\right)(\mu_\alpha x).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

Also we define

$$\hat{\Psi}_\alpha(x) = \left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \hat{u}_\alpha(x)\right) \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \hat{\psi}_\alpha(x) + \frac{n-2}{2n}\hat{\varphi}_\alpha(x)\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \hat{u}_\alpha(x)\right)^2. \tag{7.12}$$

Since $\mu_\alpha \to 0$, we get that $\hat{g}_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where ξ is the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^n$. On the other hand, thanks to (6.9), (6.13) and (7.5), we can write that

$$\hat{\Psi}_\alpha \to \left(u_0 \langle \nabla u_0, x \rangle_\xi + \frac{n-2}{2} u_0^2 \right) \text{ in } C^0_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{7.13}$$

where u_0 is as in (6.6). Setting

$$\Psi_\alpha = u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha) + \frac{n-2}{2n}(\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)u_\alpha^2, \tag{7.14}$$

we get by mixing (7.1) and (7.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha)} (qv_\alpha - 1)^2 \Psi_\alpha dv_g &= \mu_\alpha^2 \int_{B_0(1)} (q\hat{v}_\alpha - 1)^2 \hat{\Psi}_\alpha dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha}, \\ &= o(\mu_\alpha^2).\end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

Using now (6.16), we can write that there exists $C > 0$ independent of α such that

$$\left|\hat{\Psi}_\alpha(x)\right| \leq \frac{C}{|x|^{2n-4}} \tag{7.16}$$

for all $x \in B_0\left(\frac{r_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha}\right) \setminus B_0(1)$. Then, since $n \geq 5$ and $0 \leq \hat{v}_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{q}$, we get by (7.1), (7.13), (7.16), and the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)\setminus B_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha)} (qv_\alpha - 1)^2 \Psi_\alpha dv_g &= \mu_\alpha^2 \int_{B_0(r_\alpha/\mu_\alpha)\setminus B_0(1)} (q\hat{v}_\alpha - 1)^2 \hat{\Psi}_\alpha dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \\ &= o(\mu_\alpha^2).\end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

In particular, combining (7.15) and (7.17), we get that (7.9) holds true. Now, we write that

$$\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \Psi_\alpha(x) dv_g(x) = \mu_\alpha^2 \int_{B_0\left(\frac{r_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha}\right)} \hat{\Psi}_\alpha(x) dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha}(x),$$

and thus, using (6.13), (7.13), (7.16), and arguing as above, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \left\{ u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha) + \frac{n-2}{2n}(\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)u_\alpha^2 \right\} dv_g \\ &= \mu_\alpha^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(u_0 \langle \nabla u_0, x\rangle_\xi + \frac{n-2}{2} u_0^2 \right) dx + o(1) \right).\end{aligned} \tag{7.18}$$

Integrating by parts, there holds that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(u_0 \langle \nabla u_0, x\rangle_\xi + \frac{n-2}{2} u_0^2 \right) dx = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^2 dx. \tag{7.19}$$

By (7.18) and (7.19), the first equation in (7.10) holds true. The second one holds true the same way, using (6.16) and the third equation in (7.5). This ends the proof of Lemma 7.2. □

The second lemma we need to prove Proposition 7.1 is the following. Its proof only uses the fact that the sequence $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$ in (6.2) and (6.7) is bounded in L^∞. Then we can proceed as in Hebey [35] to prove it. We refer to Hebey [35] for the proof of Lemma 7.3.

Lemma 7.3. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (6.1) such that (6.3) holds true. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be such that (6.4) holds true. Let $Q_{2,\alpha}$ be as in (7.8). Then*

$$Q_{2,\alpha} = o(\mu_\alpha^2) + o(\mu_\alpha^{n-2} r_\alpha^{2-n}) \ , \tag{7.20}$$

where μ_α is as in (6.5) and r_α as in (6.12).

Now that we have Lemmas 7.2 and 7.3 we can prove Proposition 7.1.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Let $R \geq 6$ be such that $Rr_\alpha \leq 6\rho_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \gg 1$. We assume first that $r_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Given $x \in B_0(R)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} w_\alpha(x) &= r_\alpha^{n-2}\mu_\alpha^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha x)\right), \\ g_\alpha(x) &= \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}^\star g\right)(r_\alpha x), \text{ and} \\ \tilde{h}_\alpha(x) &= h_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha x)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

where h_α is as in (6.2). Since $r_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, we have that $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where ξ is the Euclidean metric. Thanks to Proposition 6.1, we also have that

$$|w_\alpha(x)| \leq C|x|^{2-n} \tag{7.22}$$

in $B_0\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)\setminus\{0\}$. By (6.1),

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha} w_\alpha + r_\alpha^2 \tilde{h}_\alpha w_\alpha = \left(\frac{\mu_\alpha}{r_\alpha}\right)^2 w_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} \tag{7.23}$$

in $B_0\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)$. Using (6.13), the fact that $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in L^∞, and standard elliptic theory, we get that, after passing to a subsequence,

$$w_\alpha \to w \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{loc}\left(B_0\left(R/2\right)\setminus\{0\}\right) \tag{7.24}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where w is non-negative and harmonic in $B_0\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)\setminus\{0\}$. Thanks to (7.22), we have that

$$|w(x)| \leq C|x|^{2-n} \tag{7.25}$$

in $B_0\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)\setminus\{0\}$. Thus, thanks to the Bôcher theorem on singularities of non-negative harmonic functions, we can write that

$$w(x) = \frac{\Lambda}{|x|^{n-2}} + \mathcal{H}(x), \tag{7.26}$$

where $\Lambda \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{H}$ is harmonic in the full ball, namely satisfies $\Delta\mathcal{H} = 0$ in $B_0\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)$. In order to see that $\Lambda = (n(n-2))^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$, we integrate (7.23) in $B_0(1)$ and proceed as in Hebey [35]. Now we prove that $\mathcal{H}(0) \leq 0$ and that $r_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. For that purpose, we return to the Riemannian Pohozaev identity (7.7). By (6.13) and (7.5),

$$Q_{3,\alpha} = O(\mu_\alpha^n r_\alpha^{-n}) + O(\mu_\alpha^{n-2} r_\alpha^{4-n}) = o(\mu_\alpha^{n-2} r_\alpha^{2-n}) + o(\mu_\alpha^2). \tag{7.27}$$

By (7.20), $Q_{2,\alpha}$ is known. By Lemma 7.2, the left hand side in (7.7) and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha$ are known. In particular, we get with (7.7), (7.20), (7.27), and Lemma 7.2 that

$$Q_{1,\alpha} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^2 dx\right)\left(\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g(\bar{x}_0) - m_0^2\right)\mu_\alpha^2 + o(\mu_\alpha^2) + o(\mu_\alpha^{n-2} r_\alpha^{2-n}), \tag{7.28}$$

where $x_\alpha \to \bar{x}_0$, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By (6.16), (7.5) and the expression of $Q_{1,\alpha}$, we have that

$$Q_{1,\alpha} = O(\mu_\alpha^{n-2} r_\alpha^{2-n}). \tag{7.29}$$

By the assumption (0.2) of Theorem 0.2, since $n \geq 5$, we get from (7.28) and (7.29) that

$$r_\alpha \to 0 \tag{7.30}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then (7.24), (7.25) and (7.26) hold true and, as one can check, we get in turn that

$$Q_{1,\alpha} = -\left(\frac{1}{2}(n-2)^2\omega_{n-1}\Lambda\mathcal{H}(0) + o(1)\right)\mu_\alpha^{n-2} r_\alpha^{2-n}. \tag{7.31}$$

Coming back to (7.28), it follows from (7.31) that

$$\frac{1}{2}(n-2)^2\omega_{n-1}\Lambda\mathcal{H}(0) = -C_n\left(\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g(\bar{x}_0) - m_0^2\right)\lim_{\alpha\to+\infty}\left(\mu_\alpha^{4-n}r_\alpha^{n-2}\right), \quad (7.32)$$

where $C_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^2 dx$. Using again the assumption (0.2) of Theorem 0.2 we get that

$$\mathcal{H}(0) \leq 0. \quad (7.33)$$

At this point, it remains to prove that $\rho_\alpha = r_\alpha$. If it is not the case, then $r_\alpha < \rho_\alpha$ and we get with (6.15) that $\left(r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\varphi(r)\right)'(1) = 0$, where

$$\varphi(r) = \frac{1}{\omega_{n-1}r^{n-1}}\int_{\partial B_0(r)} w d\sigma = \frac{(n(n-2))^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{r^{n-2}} + \mathcal{H}(0),$$

by (7.24), and (7.26). Hence $\mathcal{H}(0) = (n(n-2))^{\frac{n-2}{2}} > 0$ and we get a contradiction with (7.33). This ends the proof of Proposition 7.1. □

8. A priori bounds in the critical case

We prove the a priori bound property in Theorem 0.2. We let (M, g) be a smooth closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, $m_0, m_1, q > 0$ and $(\omega_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence in $(-m_0, m_0)$ such that $\omega_\alpha \to \omega$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some $\omega \in [-m_0, m_0]$. Also, we let $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive functions satisfying (6.1) for all α, and satisfying (6.3). We assume that (0.2) of Theorem 0.2 holds true everywhere in M. At this point, the sequence $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ is not bounded in H^1, so we cannot apply the H^1-theory for blow-up. Instead, by Lemma 6.7 in Hebey [35], we get that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for any α, there exist $N_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^\star$ and N_α critical points of u_α, denoted by $\{x_{1,\alpha}, ..., x_{N_\alpha,\alpha}\}$ such that

$$d_g(x_{i,\alpha}, x_{j,\alpha})^{\frac{n-2}{2}}u_\alpha(x_{i,\alpha}) \geq 1 \quad (8.1)$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, ..., N_\alpha\}$, $i \neq j$, and

$$\left(\min_{i=1,...,N_\alpha} d_g(x_{i,\alpha}, x)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha(x) \leq C_1 \quad (8.2)$$

for all $x \in M$ and all α. We define

$$d_\alpha = \min_{1\leq i<j\leq N_\alpha} d_g(x_{i,\alpha}, x_{j,\alpha}). \quad (8.3)$$

If $N_\alpha = 1$, we set $d_\alpha = \frac{1}{4}i_g$, where i_g is the injectivity radius of (M, g). In case $N_\alpha \geq 2$, we reorder the $x_{i,\alpha}$'s such that

$$d_\alpha = d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{2,\alpha}) \leq d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{3,\alpha}) \leq ... \leq d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{N_\alpha,\alpha}). \quad (8.4)$$

We prove now that the d_α's do not converge to zero and thus that blow-up points have to be isolated when we assume (0.2).

Proposition 8.1. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of smooth positive solutions of (6.1) such that (6.3) holds true. We assume that (0.2) holds true. Then, up to a subsequence, the sequence $(d_\alpha)_\alpha$ converges to a positive constant, where d_α is as in (8.3).*

Proof of Proposition 8.1. We proceed by contradiction and assume that $d_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, $N_\alpha \geq 2$ for α large. We assume that the concentration points are ordered in such a way that (8.4) holds true. We set for $x \in B_0(\delta d_\alpha^{-1})$, $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2} i_g$ fixed,

$$\begin{aligned} \check{u}_\alpha(x) &= d_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_{1,\alpha}}(d_\alpha x) \right), \\ \check{h}_\alpha(x) &= h_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_{1,\alpha}}(d_\alpha x) \right), \\ \check{g}_\alpha(x) &= \left(\exp^\star_{x_{1,\alpha}} g \right)(d_\alpha x), \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

where h_α is as in (6.2). We have $\check{g}_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ since $d_\alpha \to 0$. Thanks to the first equation in (6.1), we also have that

$$\Delta_{\check{g}_\alpha} \check{u}_\alpha + d_\alpha^2 \check{h}_\alpha \check{u}_\alpha = \check{u}_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} \tag{8.6}$$

in $B_0(\delta d_\alpha^{-1})$. For any $R > 0$, we let $1 \leq N_{R,\alpha} \leq N_\alpha$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} &d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{i,\alpha}) \leq R d_\alpha \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq N_{R,\alpha}, \text{ and} \\ &d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{i,\alpha}) > R d_\alpha \text{ for } N_{R,\alpha} + 1 \leq i \leq N_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Such an $N_{R,\alpha}$ does exist thanks to (8.4). We also have that $N_{R,\alpha} \geq 2$ for all $R > 1$ and that $(N_{R,\alpha})_\alpha$ is bounded for all $R > 0$ thanks to (8.3). Indeed, suppose that there are k_α points $x_{i,\alpha}$, $i = 1, ..., k_\alpha$, such that $d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{i,\alpha}) \leq R d_\alpha$. By (8.3)

$$B_{x_{i,\alpha}} \left(\frac{d_\alpha}{2} \right) \cap B_{x_{j,\alpha}} \left(\frac{d_\alpha}{2} \right) = \emptyset$$

for all $i \neq j$. Then,

$$\mathrm{Vol}_g \left(B_{x_{1,\alpha}} \left(\frac{3R}{2} d_\alpha \right) \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_\alpha} \mathrm{Vol}_g \left(B_{x_{i,\alpha}} \left(\frac{d_\alpha}{2} \right) \right)$$

and we get an upper bound for k_α depending only on R. In the sequel, we set

$$\check{x}_{i,\alpha} = d_\alpha^{-1} \exp^{-1}_{x_{1,\alpha}}(x_{i,\alpha})$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq N_\alpha$ such that $d_g(x_{1,\alpha}, x_{i,\alpha}) \leq \frac{i_g}{2}$. Thanks to (8.2), for any $R > 1$, there exists $C_R > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\Omega_{R,\alpha}} \check{u}_\alpha \leq C_R, \tag{8.7}$$

where

$$\Omega_{R,\alpha} = B_0(R) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{N_{2R,\alpha}} B_{\check{x}_{i,\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{R} \right).$$

As in Hebey [35], one easily gets that for any $R > 1$, there exists $D_R > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla \check{u}_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{R,\alpha})} \leq D_R \sup_{\Omega_{R,\alpha}} \check{u}_\alpha \leq D_R^2 \inf_{\Omega_{R,\alpha}} \check{u}_\alpha. \tag{8.8}$$

Assume first that, for some $R > 0$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq N_{R,\alpha}$ such that

$$\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha}) = O(1). \tag{8.9}$$

Since the first two equations of (6.4) are satisfied by the sequences $x_\alpha = x_{i,\alpha}$ and $\rho_\alpha = \frac{1}{8} d_\alpha$, it follows from Lemma 6.1 that the last equation in (6.4) cannot hold and thus that $(\check{u}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded in $B_{\check{x}_{i,\alpha}}\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)$. In particular, by standard

elliptic theory, thanks to (8.6) and the sequence $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$ being bounded in L^∞, $(\check{u}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded in $C^1(B_{\check{x}_{i,\alpha}}(\frac{1}{2}))$. By (8.1), assuming $i \neq 1$, we have that

$$|\check{x}_{i,\alpha}|^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha}) \geq 1$$

and we get the existence of some $\delta_i > 0$ such that

$$\check{u}_\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}|\check{x}_{i,\alpha}|^{1-\frac{n}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2}R^{1-\frac{n}{2}}$$

in $B_{\check{x}_{i,\alpha}}(\delta_i)$. If $i = 1$, applying (8.1) with $i = 1$ and $j = 2$, we get that $\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{1,\alpha}) \geq 1$, and the above inequality remains true for $R > 1$. Assume now that, for some $R > 0$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq N_{R,\alpha}$ such that

$$\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha}) \to +\infty \tag{8.10}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, (6.4) is satisfied by the sequence $x_\alpha = x_{i,\alpha}$ and $\rho_\alpha = \frac{1}{8}d_\alpha$, and it follows from Proposition 7.1 that the sequence $(\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha})\check{u}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in

$$\check{\Omega}_\alpha = B_{\check{x}_{i,\alpha}}(\tilde{\delta}_i)\backslash B_{\check{x}_{i,\alpha}}(\frac{\tilde{\delta}_i}{2})$$

for some $\tilde{\delta}_i > 0$. Thus, using the Harnack type part of (8.8), we can deduce that these two situations are mutually exclusive in the sense that either (8.9) holds true for all i or (8.10) holds true for all i. We can thus split the conclusion of the proof into two cases. In case 1 : we assume that there exist $R > 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq N_{R,\alpha}$ such that $\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha}) = O(1)$. Then, thanks to the above discussion, we get that

$$\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{j,\alpha}) = O(1)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq N_{R,\alpha}$ and all $R > 0$. Arguing as above and using (8.7) and (8.8), it follows that $(\check{u}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, by (8.6) and by elliptic theory, there exists a subsequence of $(\check{u}_\alpha)_\alpha$ which converges in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to some $\check{u}$ solution of

$$\Delta\check{u} = \check{u}^{2^\star-1}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Still thanks to the above discussion, we know that $\check{u} \not\equiv 0$. Moreover, $\check{u}$ possesses at least two critical points, namely 0 and some $\check{x}_2$, $|\check{x}_2| = 1$, limit of a subsequence of $(\check{x}_{2,\alpha})_\alpha$. This is absurd thanks to the classification result of Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [12]. In case 2 : we assume that there exist $R > 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq N_{R,\alpha}$ such that $\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha}) \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, thanks to the above discussion, we get that $\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{j,\alpha}) \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for all $1 \leq j \leq N_{R,\alpha}$ and all $R > 0$. By (8.6), we have that

$$\Delta_{\check{g}_\alpha}\check{v}_\alpha + d_\alpha^2\check{h}_\alpha\check{v}_\alpha = \frac{1}{|\check{u}_\alpha(0)|^{2^\star-2}}\check{v}_\alpha^{2^\star-1},$$

where $\check{v}_\alpha = \check{u}_\alpha(0)\check{u}_\alpha$. Applying Proposition 7.1 with the above discussion on the one hand, and standard elliptic theory with (8.8) on the other hand, we get from the preceding equation for $\check{v}_\alpha$ that, after passing to a subsequence,

$$\check{u}_\alpha(0)\check{u}_\alpha \to \check{G}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{\check{x}_i\}_{i\in I})$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where

$$I = \left\{1, ..., \lim_{R\to+\infty}\lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} N_{R,\alpha}\right\}$$

and, for any $R > 0$,

$$\check{G}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}_R} \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_i}{|x - \check{x}_i|^{n-2}} + \check{H}_R(x)$$

in $B_0(R)$, where $1 \leq \tilde{N}_R \leq N_{2R}$ is such that $|\check{x}_{\tilde{N}_R}| \leq R$ and $|\check{x}_{\tilde{N}_R+1}| > R$, and where $N_{2R,\alpha} \to N_{2R}$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Here, up to a subsequence, we assume $\check{x}_{i,\alpha} \to \check{x}_i$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for all $i \in I$. By (8.8),

$$\frac{\check{u}_\alpha(\check{x}_{i,\alpha})}{\check{u}_\alpha(0)} \to \mu_i$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some $\mu_i > 0$. In particular, the $\tilde{\Lambda}_i$'s are positive real numbers and $\check{H}_R$ is a harmonic function in $B_0(R)$. We have that

$$\check{H}_{R_1}(x) - \check{H}_{R_2}(x) = \sum_{i=\tilde{N}_{R_1}+1}^{\tilde{N}_{R_2}} \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_i}{|x - \check{x}_i|^{n-2}}$$

for all $0 < R_1 < R_2$. We can write that

$$\check{G}(x) = \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_1}{|x|^{n-2}} + X(x)$$

where for any $R > 1$ and any $x \notin \{\check{x}_i, i \in I\}$,

$$X(x) = \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{N}_R} \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_i}{|x - \check{x}_i|^{n-2}} + \check{H}_R(x).$$

For $R > 1$, we set $\Omega_{R,\tilde{\gamma}} = B_0(R) \setminus \cup_{i=2}^{\tilde{N}_R} B_{\check{x}_i}(\tilde{\gamma})$. Since R is fixed, we can choose $0 < \tilde{\gamma} \ll 1$ such that X attains its minimum over $\partial\Omega_{R,\tilde{\gamma}}$ in $\partial B_0(R)$. Hence, using the maximum principle for the harmonic function X in $\Omega_{R,\tilde{\gamma}}$ and that $\check{G} \geq 0$, we get $X(0) \geq -\tilde{\Lambda}_1 R^{2-n}$. Since $R > 1$ is arbitrary, $X(0) \geq 0$. By Proposition 7.1, we now get that $X(0) = 0$. For $R > 1$ fixed, we let $\tilde{\Omega}_{R,\tilde{\gamma}} = B_0(R) \setminus \cup_{i=3}^{\tilde{N}_R} B_{\check{x}_i}(\tilde{\gamma})$. We can choose again $0 < \tilde{\gamma} \ll 1$ such that $X - \tilde{\Lambda}_2/|. - \check{x}_2|^{n-2}$ attains its minimum over $\partial\tilde{\Omega}_{R,\tilde{\gamma}}$ in $\partial B_0(R)$. Hence, using the maximum principle for the harmonic function $X - \tilde{\Lambda}_2/|. - \check{x}_2|^{n-2}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_{R,\tilde{\gamma}}$ and that $\check{G} \geq 0$, we get that

$$X(0) \geq \tilde{\Lambda}_2 - \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_1}{R^{n-2}} - \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_2}{(R-1)^{n-2}}.$$

Choosing $R \gg 1$ sufficiently large, we get that $X(0) > 0$ and this is in contradiction with $X(0) = 0$. This ends the proof of the Proposition 8.1. □

We are now in position to prove the a priori bound property in Theorem 0.2. This is the subject of what follows.

Proof of the a priori bound property in Theorem 0.2. By Druet and Hebey [24], and Hebey and Truong [37], we only need to address the cases $n \geq 5$. Then the proof mixes the results of Propositions 7.1 and 8.1. By Proposition 8.1, M being compact, $(N_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a bounded sequence. Up to a subsequence, we can assume that $N_\alpha = N$ for all α and some $N \in \mathbb{N}^\star$. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of maximal points of u_α. By

(6.3), $u_\alpha(x_\alpha) \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ and we get by (8.2) that $d_g(x_{i,\alpha}, x_\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for some i. Then, by Proposition 8.1, noting that

$$d_g(x_\alpha, x) u_\alpha^{\frac{2}{n-2}}(x) \leq d_g(x_\alpha, x_{i,\alpha}) u_\alpha^{\frac{2}{n-2}}(x_\alpha) + d_g(x_{i,\alpha}, x) u_\alpha^{\frac{2}{n-2}}(x) \ , \tag{8.11}$$

we get that (6.4) holds true with the x_α's and $\rho_\alpha = \bar{\delta}$, for some $\bar{\delta} > 0$. But this contradicts Proposition 7.1 for which $\rho_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In particular, there does not exists a sequence $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ of smooth positive solutions of (6.1) such that (6.3) holds true. Standard elliptic theory concludes the proof of the a priori bound property in Theorem 0.2. □

9. A remark on (0.2)

The assumption (0.2) in Theorem 0.2 is sharp in the following sense : if we take for (M, g) the standard sphere S^n and if we consider the first equation of (0.1) with $\omega = 0$ and $m_0^2 = \frac{n(n-2)}{4} = \frac{(n-2)}{4(n-1)} S_g$, then (0.2) is not satisfied, and there are indeed blowing-up solutions (u_α, v_α) for the system, where u_α is given by (2.21) and $v_\alpha = \Phi(u_\alpha)$, with Φ as in (1.4). Yet, we have to be careful generally speaking about the necessity of an assumption telling that the potential needs to sit below the geometric threshold $\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g$ to get the existence of positive solutions and a priori bounds, when this potential depends on the solution, as in this paper. This is stated more precisely in the following proposition, which is proved in this section.

Proposition 9.1. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold ($n \geq 5$) and q, m_0, $m_1 > 0$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ be given. We can build a continuous map $\bar{h} : \mathbb{R} \times C^{1,\theta} \to C^{0,\theta}$ satisfying that*

(i) $\bar{h}_\omega(u) > \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g$ somewhere in M for all ω and all u,

(ii) $\bar{h}_\omega(u)$ is nonnegative nonzero for all ω and all u,

(iii) $\bar{h}$ is uniformly bounded in subsets $K \times C^{1,\theta}$ for $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ compact,

(iv) the system (9.1) below admits at least a positive constant solution,

and satisfying that, for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any positive solution $(u, v) \in C^2$ of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u + \bar{h}_\omega(u) u = u^{2^\star - 1} + \omega^2 (1 - qv)^2 u \\ \Delta_g v + (m_1^2 + q^2 u^2) v = q u^2 \ , \end{cases} \tag{9.1}$$

we have that $\|u\|_{C^{1,\beta}} + \|v\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq C$.

The first condition on $\bar{h}$ is the most significant ; the other ones are here to ensure that our result has some interest. In our definition of $\bar{h}$, we let

$$\bar{h}_\omega(u) = \check{h}(u) + \omega^2 (1 - qv)^2, \tag{9.2}$$

where $v = \Phi(u)$, with Φ as in (1.4). Thus, proving Proposition 9.1 amounts to prove the existence of $\check{h} : C^{1,\theta} \to C^{0,\theta}$ satisfying conditions like (i)-(iv), and the existence of $C > 0$ such that for all positive solution $u \in C^2$ of

$$\Delta_g u + \check{h}(u) u = u^{2^\star - 1} \tag{9.3}$$

we have that $\|u\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq C$. By elliptic theory, every nonnegative nonzero weak solution in H^1 of (9.3) is actually positive and in C^2. As the proof of Proposition

9.1 below shows, we may even require that $\|\check{h}(u)\|_{C^0} = \tilde{K}$ for all $u \in C^1$, for some $\tilde{K} \gg 1$ arbitrarily large and still obtain uniform bounds for the positive C^2-solutions of (9.3).

Proof of Proposition 9.1. Let q, m_0, $m_1 > 0$ be given. (M, g) being a given closed Riemannian n-manifold with $n \geq 5$, we define here a map $\bar{h} : \mathbb{R} \times C^{1,\theta} \to C^{0,\theta}$ such that Proposition 9.1 is true. Let $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Note first that the function

$$\Psi_0 : \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R}^n & \to & \mathbb{R} \\ x & \mapsto & \frac{n-2}{2} u_0^2(x) + \langle x, \nabla u_0(x) \rangle_\xi u_0(x), \end{array} \right.$$

is positive in $B_0\left(\sqrt{n(n-2)}\right)$, where u_0 is as in (6.6). We choose any $\tilde{K} > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{K} > \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0^2 dx}{\int_{B_0\left(\sqrt{n(n-2)}\right)} \Psi_0(x) dx} \left(-\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} \min_M S_g \right). \tag{9.4}$$

In particular, we may also ask that $\tilde{K} > \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} \max_M S_g$ and we assume from now on that this is true. We pick some $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $0 \leq \varphi \leq \tilde{K}$, $\varphi(z) = \tilde{K}$ for $z \geq 0$ and $\varphi(z) = 0$ for $z \leq -1$. We define, for $y \in M$

$$\begin{aligned} &\check{h}(u)(y) = \varphi\left(\sqrt{\frac{n-2}{n}} |u(y)|^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - |\nabla u(y)| \right), \\ &\bar{h}_\omega(u)(y) = \check{h}(u)(y) + \omega^2 (1 - q\Phi(u))^2. \end{aligned} \tag{9.5}$$

We have that $\bar{h}_\omega(u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in C^1$ and that $\left(\tilde{K}^{\frac{n-2}{4}}, \frac{q \tilde{K}^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{m_1^2 + q^2 \tilde{K}^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \right)$ is a constant positive solution of (9.1). Easy computations, using the mean value theorem, give that $\check{h} : C^{1,\theta} \to C^{0,\theta}$ is continuous, and then, $\bar{h} : \mathbb{R} \times C^{1,\theta} \to C^{0,\theta}$ is also continuous by elliptic theory. To see that $\bar{h}$ satisfies (i)-(iv) of Proposition 9.1, it is sufficient to check that Step 9.1 holds true.

Step 9.1. *There holds* $\sup_M \bar{h}_\omega(u) \in \left[\tilde{K}, \tilde{K} + \omega^2\right]$. *In particular,* $\bar{h}_\omega(u) \not\equiv 0$ *and* $\sup_M \bar{h}_\omega(u) > \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} \max_M S_g$.

Proof of Step 9.1. As $0 \leq \Phi(u) \leq \frac{1}{q}$, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\sup_M \check{h}(u) = \tilde{K} \ , \tag{9.6}$$

if $u \in C^{1,\theta}$. Indeed, for any critical point x of u, $\check{h}(u)(x) = \tilde{K}$ and (9.6) is true. Step 9.1 is proved. □

Now we prove the uniform bounds in Proposition 9.1. Assume by contradiction that $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ is a blowing-up sequence of positive C^2 solutions of (9.1), namely

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u_\alpha + \bar{h}_{\omega_\alpha}(u_\alpha) u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} + \omega_\alpha^2 (1 - q v_\alpha)^2 u_\alpha \\ \Delta_g v_\alpha + (m_1^2 + q^2 u_\alpha^2) v_\alpha = q u_\alpha^2 \ , \end{cases} \tag{9.7}$$

where $(\omega_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a sequence of real numbers. Since $0 \leq v_\alpha \leq \frac{1}{q}$, we have

$$\max_M u_\alpha \to +\infty \tag{9.8}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Once more, the first equation in (9.7) can be written

$$\Delta_g u_\alpha + \check{h}(u_\alpha) u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} \tag{9.9}$$

where $\check{h}(u_\alpha)$ is as in (9.5) and is independent of the physical parameters m_0, m_1, q and ω_α. Replacing the system (6.1) by (9.7), and thus h_α given in (6.2) by $\check{h}(u_\alpha)$, our a priori analysis of Section 6 applies to the new sequence $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$, since we only need there a C^0 bound on $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$. On the contrary, the arguments in Section 7 use the precise form of the potentials h_α which are replaced in our cases by the $\check{h}(u_\alpha)$'s, and need to be rewritten. First we prove that the following analogue of Proposition (7.1) holds true for our sequence $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ of solutions of (9.7), while (0.2) is not satisfied, by (i).

Proposition 9.2. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian n-manifold, $n \geq 5$, and $((u_\alpha, v_\alpha))_\alpha$ be a sequence of C^2 positive solutions of (9.7) such that (9.8) holds true. Let $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\rho_\alpha)_\alpha$ be such that (6.4) holds true. Then $r_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$,*

$$r_\alpha = \rho_\alpha \tag{9.10}$$

for all α, and

$$r_\alpha^{n-2} \mu_\alpha^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha x)\right) \to \frac{(n(n-2))^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{|x|^{n-2}} + \mathcal{H}(x) \tag{9.11}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(B_0(2)\backslash\{0\})$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where μ_α is as in (6.5), r_α as in (6.12), and $\mathcal{H}$ is a harmonic function in $B_0(2)$ which satisfies that $\mathcal{H}(0) \leq 0$.

We first investigate the asymptotic behaviour of $\left(\check{h}(u_\alpha)\right)_\alpha$ near the blow-up point x_α.

Step 9.2. *We define $\tilde{h}_\alpha$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by*

$$\tilde{h}_\alpha(x) = \check{h}(u_\alpha)\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \tag{9.12}$$

where μ_α is defined in (6.5) and x_α as in (6.4), for all α. Then,

$$\tilde{h}_\alpha \to \tilde{K} \mathbb{1}_{B_0\left(\sqrt{n(n-2)}\right)} \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{9.13}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$.

Proof of Step 9.2. Using (6.9), we have

$$\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n-2}{n}} u_\alpha^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - |\nabla u_\alpha| \right) \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \to v_0(x) \left(\sqrt{n(n-2)} - |x| \right) \tag{9.14}$$

in $C^0_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $v_0(x) = \frac{1}{n}\left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{n(n-2)}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Coming back to (9.5), we get Step 9.2. □

Proof of Proposition 9.2. We are in position to prove Proposition 9.2 by adapting the proof of Proposition 7.1. We let X_α as in (7.4). We apply again the Pohozaev identity given in Druet and Hebey [23] to u_α in $B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \check{h}(u_\alpha) \left\{ u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha) + \frac{n-2}{2n} (\mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha) u_\alpha^2 \right\} dv_g \\ &= -\frac{n-2}{4n} \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} (\Delta_g \mathrm{div}_g X_\alpha)\, u_\alpha^2 dv_g + Q_{1,\alpha} - Q_{2,\alpha} + Q_{3,\alpha} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{9.15}$$

where $Q_{i,\alpha}$, $i=1,2,3$, is given by (7.8). Up to a subsequence, $x_\alpha \to \bar{x}_0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. For the right hand side of (9.15), the second estimate in (7.10) and estimates (7.20) and (7.27) hold true using as above (6.9), (6.13), (6.16) and (7.5). Concerning the left hand side of (9.15), we get from (6.9), (6.16), the dominated convergence theorem and (9.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r_\alpha)} \check{h}(u_\alpha)\left\{u_\alpha X_\alpha(\nabla u_\alpha)+\frac{n-2}{2n}\mathrm{div}_g(X_\alpha)u_\alpha^2\right\}dv_g\\&=\mu_\alpha^2\left(\tilde{K}\int_{B_0\left(\sqrt{n(n-2)}\right)}\Psi_0 dx+o(1)\right).\end{aligned}\tag{9.16}$$

Here we used that $n\geq 5$ and that $\left(\check{h}(u_\alpha)\right)_\alpha$ is bounded in L^∞ by (9.6). Plugging these estimates in (9.15), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}Q_{1,\alpha}=\ &\mu_\alpha^2\left(\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g(\bar{x}_0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}u_0^2dx+\tilde{K}\int_{B_0(\sqrt{n(n-2)})}\Psi_0(x)dx\right)\\&+o(\mu_\alpha^2)+o(\mu_\alpha^{n-2}r_\alpha^{2-n})\\&\geq \eta\mu_\alpha^2+o(\mu_\alpha^2)+o(\mu_\alpha^{n-2}r_\alpha^{2-n})\end{aligned}\tag{9.17}$$

for some $\eta>0$. Indeed, by (9.4), such a $\eta>0$ does exist. Since (7.29) holds true by (6.16) and (7.5), we get from (9.17) and since $n\geq 5$ that

$$r_\alpha \to 0\tag{9.18}$$

as $\alpha\to+\infty$. Defining w_α as in (7.21), we get that (7.24), (7.25) and (7.26) hold true. We then have (9.11) for some $\mathcal{H}$ harmonic in $B_0(2)$. In the end, (7.29) can be improved in (7.31) and combined with (9.17) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}(n-2)^2\omega_{n-1}\Lambda\mathcal{H}(0)\leq -\eta\liminf_{\alpha\to+\infty}\left(\mu_\alpha^{4-n}r_\alpha^{n-2}\right),\tag{9.19}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{H}(0)\leq 0$. At last, mimicking the end of the proof of Proposition 7.1 shows that (9.10) holds true, which completes the proof of Proposition 9.2. □

It is now straightforward to see that the arguments developed in Section 8 apply to our sequence $((u_\alpha,v_\alpha))_\alpha$ of blowing-up solutions of (9.7), thanks to Proposition (9.2). In particular, we obtain a contradiction with (6.3), as in the last part of Section 8. By elliptic theory with (9.6) and (9.9), we get that $((u_\alpha,v_\alpha))_\alpha$ is bounded in $C^{1,\beta}$ for all $\beta\in(0,1)$. This completes the proof of Proposition 9.1. □

Blow-up solutions for equations like (9.9) can be found in Esposito, Pistoia and Vétois [30], Hebey [35], and Robert and Vétois [48, 47]. We refer also to Druet, Hebey and Vétois [27], and Hebey and Wei [39] on what concerns (0.1), and to Clapp, Ghimenti and Micheletti [14] and Ghimenti and Micheletti [32] for the semi-classical setting associated to (0.1).

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti and P. H. Rabinowitz. Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications. *J. Functional Analysis*, 14:349–381, 1973.

[2] T. Aubin. Équations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 55(3):269–296, 1976.

[3] A. Azzollini, L. Pisani, and A. Pomponio. Improved estimates and a limit case for the electrostatic Klein-Gordon-Maxwell system. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 141(3):449–463, 2011.

[4] A. Azzollini and A. Pomponio. Ground state solutions for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon-Maxwell equations. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, 35(1):33–42, 2010.

[5] V. Benci and C. Bonanno. Solitary waves and vortices in non-Abelian gauge theories with matter. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 12(4):717–735, 2012.

[6] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. Solitary waves of the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation coupled with the Maxwell equations. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 14(4):409–420, 2002.

[7] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. Solitary waves of the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation coupled with the Maxwell equations. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 14(4):409–420, 2002.

[8] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. Solitary waves in the nonlinear wave equation and in gauge theories. *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 1(1):61–86, 2007.

[9] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. Existence of hylomorphic solitary waves in Klein-Gordon and in Klein-Gordon-Maxwell equations. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Rend. Lincei (9) Mat. Appl.*, 20(3):243–279, 2009.

[10] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. Spinning Q-balls for the Klein-Gordon-Maxwell equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 295(3):639–668, 2010.

[11] H. Brézis and L. Nirenberg. Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 36(4):437–477, 1983.

[12] L. A. Caffarelli, B. Gidas, and J. Spruck. Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev growth. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 42(3):271–297, 1989.

[13] D. Cassani. Existence and non-existence of solitary waves for the critical Klein-Gordon equation coupled with Maxwell's equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 58(7-8):733–747, 2004.

[14] M. Clapp, M. Ghimenti, and A. M. Micheletti. Semiclassical states for a static supercritical Klein-Gordon-Maxwell-Proca system on a closed Riemannian manifold. 2013. Preprint.

[15] T. D'Aprile and D. Mugnai. Non-existence results for the coupled Klein-Gordon-Maxwell equations. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 4(3):307–322, 2004.

[16] T. D'Aprile and D. Mugnai. Solitary waves for nonlinear Klein-Gordon-Maxwell and Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 134(5):893–906, 2004.

[17] T. D'Aprile and J. Wei. Layered solutions for a semilinear elliptic system in a ball. *J. Differential Equations*, 226(1):269–294, 2006.

[18] T. D'Aprile and J. Wei. Solutions en grappe autour des centres harmoniques d'un système elliptique couplé. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 24(4):605–628, 2007.

[19] P. d'Avenia and L. Pisani. Nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations coupled with Born-Infeld type equations. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 26, 13, 2002.

[20] P. d'Avenia, L. Pisani, and G. Siciliano. Dirichlet and Neumann problems for Klein-Gordon-Maxwell systems. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 71(12):e1985–e1995, 2009.

[21] P. d'Avenia, L. Pisani, and G. Siciliano. Klein-Gordon-Maxwell systems in a bounded domain. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 26(1):135–149, 2010.

[22] O. Druet. Compactness for Yamabe metrics in low dimensions. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 23:1143–1191, 2004.

[23] O. Druet and E. Hebey. Stability for strongly coupled critical elliptic systems in a fully inhomogeneous medium. *Anal. PDE*, 2(3):305–359, 2009.

[24] O. Druet and E. Hebey. Existence and a priori bounds for electrostatic Klein-Gordon-Maxwell systems in fully inhomogeneous spaces. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 12(5):831–869, 2010.

[25] O. Druet, E. Hebey, and P. Laurain. Stability of elliptic PDEs with respect to perturbations of the domain. *J. Differential Equations*, 255(10):3703–3718, 2013.

[26] O. Druet, E. Hebey, and F. Robert. *Blow-up theory for elliptic PDEs in Riemannian geometry*, volume 45 of *Mathematical Notes*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2004.

[27] O. Druet, E. Hebey, and J. Vétois. Stable phases for the 4-dimensional KGMP system. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* To appear.

[28] O. Druet, E. Hebey, and J. Vétois. Bounded stability for strongly coupled critical elliptic systems below the geometric threshold of the conformal Laplacian. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(3):999–1059, 2010.

[29] O. Druet and P. Laurain. Stability of the Pohožaev obstruction in dimension 3. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1117–1149, 2010.

[30] P. Esposito, A. Pistoia, and J. Vétois. The effect of linear perturbations on the Yamabe problem. *Math. Ann.* to appear.
[31] V. Georgiev and N. Visciglia. Solitary waves for Klein-Gordon-Maxwell system with external Coulomb potential. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 84(7):957–983, 2005.
[32] M. Ghimenti and A. M. Micheletti. Number and profile of low energy solutions for singularly perturbed Klein-Gordon-Maxwell systems on a Riemannian manifold. 2013. Preprint.
[33] B. Gidas and J. Spruck. A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 6(8):883–901, 1981.
[34] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
[35] E. Hebey. *Compactness and stability for nonlinear elliptic equations*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society. To appear.
[36] E. Hebey. Solitary waves in critical abelian gauge theories. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 32(5):1747–1761, 2012.
[37] E. Hebey and T. T. Truong. Static Klein-Gordon-Maxwell-Proca systems in 4-dimensional closed manifolds. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 667:221–248, 2012.
[38] E. Hebey and M. Vaugon. The best constant problem in the Sobolev embedding theorem for complete Riemannian manifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 79(1):235–279, 1995.
[39] E. Hebey and J. Wei. Resonant states for the static Klein-Gordon-Maxwell-Proca system. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 19(4):953–967, 2012.
[40] E. Hebey and J. Wei. Schrödinger-Poisson systems in the 3-sphere. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 47(1-2):25–54, 2013.
[41] Y. Li and L. Zhang. Liouville-type theorems and Harnack-type inequalities for semilinear elliptic equations. *J. Anal. Math.*, 90:27–87, 2003.
[42] Y. Li and M. Zhu. Yamabe type equations on three-dimensional Riemannian manifolds. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 1(1):1–50, 1999.
[43] Y. Y. Li and L. Zhang. A Harnack type inequality for the Yamabe equation in low dimensions. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(2):133–151, 2004.
[44] Y. Y. Li and L. Zhang. Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem. II. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 24(2):185–237, 2005.
[45] D. Mugnai. Coupled Klein-Gordon and Born-Infeld-type equations: looking for solitary waves. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 460(2045):1519–1527, 2004.
[46] D. Mugnai. Solitary waves in abelian gauge theories with strongly nonlinear potentials. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 27(4):1055–1071, 2010.
[47] F. Robert and J. Vétois. Examples of non-isolated blow-up for perturbations of the scalar curvature equation. 2012. Preprint.
[48] F. Robert and J. Vétois. A General Theorem for the Construction of Blowing-up Solutions to Some Elliptic Nonlinear Equations with Lyapunov-Schmidt's Finite-dimensional Reduction, Cocompact Imbeddings, Profile Decompositions, and their Applications to PDE. *Trends Math.*, pages 85–116, 2013.
[49] M. Struwe. A global compactness result for elliptic boundary value problems involving limiting nonlinearities. *Math. Z.*, 187(4):511–517, 1984.
[50] N. S. Trudinger. Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3)*, 22:265–274, 1968.

Pierre-Damien Thizy, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Département de Mathématiques, Site de Saint-Martin, 2 avenue Adolphe Chauvin, 95302 Cergy-Pontoise cedex, France
E-mail address: pierre-damien.thizy@u-cergy.fr